

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Mercedes Bayon	Team: Squad #13	CCRB Case #: 201507017	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 08/09/2015 4:03 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 75	18 Mo. SOL 2/9/2017	EO SOL 2/9/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported Sun, 08/09/2015 9:50 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 08/20/2015 12:22 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SSA Robert Martinez	01369	922716	075 PCT
2. POM David Quattrocchi	15010	952133	075 PCT
3. POM Tony Cuoco	17359	950261	075 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SSA Robert Martinez	Force: SSA Robert Martinez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM David Quattrocchi	Force: PO David Quattrocchi used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM Tony Cuoco	Force: PO Tony Cuoco used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On August 9, 2015, Sgt. Robert Martinez, assigned to the 75th Precinct reported this incident to the Internal Affairs Bureau. The CCRB received this complaint on August 20, 2015, via IAB log number 15-23555. § 87(2)(g)

There was no telephone number provided for the victim, § 87(2)(b) at the time the complaint was filed.

On August 21, 2015, the undersigned investigator mailed § 87(2)(b) a please call letter and also requested a Lexis Nexis search. On August 24, 2015, the Lexis Nexis search returned a telephone number for § 87(2)(b). On the same date, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) but an automated message stated that the telephone number was disconnected. The investigator also conducted a search of CTS for additional contact information for § 87(2)(b) which revealed one previous complaint for § 87(2)(b). This complaint provided a second address as well as a telephone number for § 87(2)(b) and a telephone number for his girlfriend, § 87(2)(b). A please call letter was mailed to § 87(2)(b) at the address identified via the CTS search. Additionally, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) telephone number from his previous CTS complaint five times between August 24, 2015 and September 4, 2015; however, the telephone never rang and no voicemail engaged on each occasion. On August 24, 2015, the investigator searched White Pages for additional contact information for § 87(2)(b) which returned negative results. The investigator also searched BADS, which returned a third address for § 87(2)(b) and on the same day, a please call letter was mailed to the address. A Lexis Nexis search was also requested for the address located via BADS, which returned a different telephone number. On the same date, the investigator called the telephone number identified via BADS and a female answered the telephone and stated that she did not know anyone by the name § 87(2)(b).

Between August 24, 2015 and August 31, 2015, the undersigned investigator called § 87(2)(b) four times and left a voicemail message on each occasion. On September 4, 2015, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) at which time she stated that she would obtain § 87(2)(b) attorney's information and provide it to the CCRB to contact him. On August 27, 2014, the investigator contacted the CCRB IAB Liaison Unit and confirmed that they forwarded the CCRB all of § 87(2)(b) contact information. On August 31, 2015, second please call letters were mailed to § 87(2)(b) at all three addresses located by the CCRB. On September 9, 2015, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) at which time she provided the investigator with § 87(2)(b) attorney information. § 87(2)(b) stated that § 87(2)(b) did not have a telephone, but provided an address for § 87(2)(b). On the same date, the investigator mailed § 87(2)(b) a please call letter at the address § 87(2)(b) provided. Additionally, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) attorney, § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) stated that he would permit § 87(2)(b) to provide a statement and asked that the investigator email him options for dates and times for § 87(2)(b) to be interviewed and the investigator emailed § 87(2)(b) two different dates and times for interviews. § 87(2)(b) did not respond to the email. On September 15, 2015, the investigator left a message with § 87(2)(b) secretary, and also sent him a follow-up email about interviewing § 87(2)(b). On September 17, 2015, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) and left a message with his secretary asking that he contact the investigator with an interview date by September 21, 2015. On September 22, 2015, the investigator called § 87(2)(b) and left a message with his secretary asking that § 87(2)(b) have § 87(2)(b) contact the CCRB and to inform him that without a statement from § 87(2)(b) the case will likely be closed by the end of the week. To date, neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) have contacted the CCRB. § 87(2)(g)

Pod:

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Pod Leader: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Attorney: _____
Title/Signature Print Date